

Weekly National Intelligencer.

WASHINGTON: THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1863.

Weekly National Intelligencer.

BY GALES & SEATON.
JAMES O. WELLS, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.
The subscription price of this paper for a year is TWO DOLLARS, payable in advance.

A reduction of 20 per cent. (one-fifth of the full charge) will be made to any one who shall order and pay for, at one time, ten copies of the Weekly paper; and a reduction of 25 per cent. (one-fourth of the full charge) to any one who will order and pay for, at one time, twenty or more copies.

No accounts being kept for this paper, it will not be sent to any one unless paid for in advance, nor any longer than the time for which it is paid.

MILITARY PROCEEDINGS IN MARYLAND.

In one of his letters on the military abduction of slaves in Maryland Governor BRADFORD expressed the opinion that while these violent proceedings were ostensibly carried on in the name of executing a law of Congress, (which, however, authorizes no such thing), they were really instigated with a view to a very different purpose.

The conduct of the military agents who abduct the slaves makes it plain that in executing their instructions, they are governed neither by military considerations nor by feelings of philanthropy toward the slave. That they do not proceed on their mission under military principles, or for military purposes, is made plain by the fact that they do not abduct all the slaves suitable for military service who come within their reach, but make discriminations in favor of some owners and against others, according to alleged political partialities. That is, the execution of these proceedings is *partial* in its effect—visiting the loss of their slave property on men who hold certain political opinions. In illustration of this fact, we learn that certain gentlemen on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, who sustain the policy of the Administration, have had their abducted slaves returned to them by the military—a course which would not have been pursued if the slaves had been originally abducted for military reasons. And where the slaves of some masters are thus left in bondage, while the slaves of others are taken for military service, it is equally plain that no feelings of humanity toward the slave enter into these proceedings, which are thus left as much without the excuse of "philanthropy" as they are obviously without the defense of law.

Arbitrarily inflicted in penalty for certain opinions supposed to be held by men who do not support the Administration, (but who do nothing against the Government, for if they did they could, with the approval of all good citizens, be legally tried and punished for disloyalty), these acts bear all the marks of what Governor Bradford truly calls the "law of arms." What wonder that, under such circumstances, the Governor of this loyal Slaveholding State should be constrained to write as follows:

"I was most anxious, therefore, as I still am, to avert if possible such a proceeding; for I have no hesitation in saying that, enforced as it now is, without the sanction of Congress, by the mere law of arms, without precedent in any other loyal State, and in the absence of any imminent military necessity, it is calculated to inflict irreparable damage upon the Union cause, and is alarming, agitating, provoking, and disgusting our Union-loving and Government-supporting citizens beyond any thing that has lately occurred in the State."

But, as if to place these violent proceedings in a still more odious light, it is now publicly avowed by the original apologist of the project that the slaves abducted from their masters and decoyed into the military service "are not thereby made free either in law or fact." Such is the opinion of the Judge Bond who has so strangely lent his judicial name to the defense of this policy, and it is in comment on his opinion to this effect that Gov. Bradford, in a recent letter, holds the following significant language:

"If it [the act of July 17, 1862] confers the power claimed for it, it amounts, as I have said in my previous letter, to a practical emancipation of the most valuable class of slave property, and would, to a great extent, render unnecessary the provisions for the freedom of such slaves, otherwise so particularly exacted. It is true the Judge denies this position, and we can hardly avoid a smile at the gravity with which he declares that this 'does not in law or fact emancipate the slave, but merely makes him a military slave.' It might not be amiss to have some more definite understanding upon this point, in which the poor deluded slave, quite as much as the plundered master, may be supposed to feel a lively interest. In it indeed proposed, after coaxing these ignorant and dependent creatures into the military service of the country, sending them from State to State to fight her battles, exposing them to disease and death in every form, to send back again into slavery those who may survive the conflict? Such must be the purpose of the Government, or Judge Bond would not seriously tell us, as he does, that this act would not in law or fact emancipate the slave."

This is a severe criticism, but who shall say that it is not just? And when any policy of the Administration becomes liable to such objections from loyal men, (for we presume nobody will question the "loyalty" of Gov. Bradford), we submit that it becomes the duty, as it is the right, of all good citizens to expostulate with the military authorities in Washington against the longer tolerance of violent practices which the Governor of Maryland assures us are "alarming, agitating, provoking, and disgusting our Union-loving and Government-supporting citizens" of that State. What makes it more insulting to the citizens of this gallant State is the fact that they alone are selected for such punitive inflictions of military violence. The people of Kentucky are not thus harassed in their property or their homes, and surely it is not meant to mete out one measure of justice to Kentucky and another to Maryland. Whether the interests of the Government, of loyal slaveholders, or of the slaves themselves are concerned in the solution of this question, we can see no propriety nor rightfulness in such discriminations as regards loyal Slaveholding States, where the only difference between them is the fact that one is stronger than the other, and that in Kentucky there are more slaves who could be abducted and enlisted in our armies than there are in Maryland. We should, therefore, naturally expect to see Kentucky rather than Maryland made the recruiting field of this new policy for replenishing the negro regiments, if purely military considerations had any thing to do with the matter. But in view of the steadfast and active loyalty manifested by this great State, under such severe trials, we should sincerely regret to see a similar experiment extended to her soil.

LOYALTY TO THE CONSTITUTION.

We had occasion to cite a few days ago some observations of Mr. Secretary SEWARD, contained in a despatch addressed to our Minister to London under date of last November 10th, in comment on the resumption of political discussions and divisions in this country, after their temporary subsidence on the outbreak of the war. While reporting the existence of dissensions among us as to the expediency or rightfulness of certain measures of policy adopted by the Administration, and while acknowledging the right of American citizens "freely to canvass the proceedings of the Administration," as it had been their habit to do "without a thought of disloyalty towards the Government," Mr. Seward did not omit to do full justice to the predominant sentiment of the American people, without regard to partisan discriminations or honest differences of opinion. To this effect he wrote as follows:

"It will suffice to say that while there may be men of doubtful political wisdom and virtue in each party, and while there may be differences of opinion between the two parties as to the measures best calculated to preserve the Union and restore its authority, yet it is not to be inferred that either party or any considerable portion of the people of the loyal States, is disposed to accept disunion under any circumstances or upon any terms."

And to this declaration was added another, which, as well for the terseness of its expression as for the political truth it inculcates, deserves, as an "apple of gold," to be set "in pictures of silver." He wrote:

"We are under obligations to save not only the integrity or unity of the country, but also its inalienable and precious Constitution."

There are some men who loosely talk, and, we regret to say, some who loosely act, as if these two-fold obligations were not equally imperative. The true patriot is he who as keenly resents an attack on the Constitution as on the integrity or unity of the national territory. For the Constitution is to the country what the informing spirit is to the body it animates and vitalizes. No man can be loyal to the country, or to the Government, or to the temporary Administration of the Government, without being loyal to the Constitution, by which "the country" is made an organic body politic, by which "the Government" becomes the "constituted authority" of the land, and by which "the Administration" is made the depositary of the nation's power and the executor of the nation's will, as far as the one is granted and the other expressed under the limitations of that great charter. It is of such a loyalty, as the controlling sentiment of the patriot's breast, that the Rev. Dr. Bushnell writes when he holds the following language:

"Loyalty is no subject of law or legal definition. It belongs entirely to the moral department of life. It is what a man thinks and contrives, not to being commanded, but of his own accord, for his country's honor—his great sentiment, his deep and high devotion, the fire of his habitual or inborn homage to his country's welfare. It goes before all constitutions, and goes by the letter of all statutes, and is the only power that can make them right feeling what the petty constructions and lagging judgments of the State cannot find to compel. It does not measure itself by what the Constitution or the laws prescribe. It has no art of contriving, for itself and others, how to hide from the country behind the Constitution. It loves what the Constitution loves, and keeps it only the more rational that it will even die for its object."

There is a technical loyalty which, having no spring in "high devotion" or "inborn homage" to the country's welfare, is perpetually measuring itself by what "the Constitution or the laws prescribe." The man who has this kind of loyalty may be a good subject of the Government under which he lives, but he has not yet risen to the character of a good citizen. The good citizen is one who, as Dr. Bushnell says, is loyal because "he loves what the Constitution loves." With him loyalty is a spontaneous sentiment belonging to the moral department of his inner life—not a soulless entity of law or legal definition. But yet not a sentiment which, however spontaneous in its source, is permitted to overflow the boundaries of the Constitution and the laws, for, though it "goes before all Constitutions," it goes none the less "by the letter of all statutes" as the rule of political life, and within the sphere of the State, it limits the objects of its political authority to what the "Constitution loves" or permits. It is not a will sent because it is free in its origin, and it is none the less free in its origin because it diffuses itself through the channels marked out by the nation's collective will, or expressed in the fundamental law of the land.

IMPORTANT QUESTIONS UNDER THE HABEAS CORPUS SUSPENSION.

The Boston Traveller reports five interesting cases brought before Judge Sprague, of the United States court, on Saturday last. A man named Cassidy, of Lowell, asked for a writ of habeas corpus on the ground that he had been a convicted felon; John Fagan, of Framingham, asked for a writ on the ground that he was an alien; three others claimed writs as minors. Mr. Sweetser, of Lowell, who appeared for Cassidy, urged that Congress did not intend to confer upon the President power to suspend the writ in all cases; and that the President did not intend to suspend it in the case of persons who were not legally liable to military duty; these points he argued at length. Mr. Alger, of Lowell, counsel for Fagan, urged that as a friendly alien his client was entitled to the same privileges that an American citizen would be in Great Britain. Gen. Devens, who held the prisoners in the military service, argued that the court had no jurisdiction in the case since the issuing of the proclamation, and that the proceedings having been commenced before the proclamation was issued was of no advantage. On the latter point Mr. Sweetser coincided. The Court remarked that novel questions had been raised, which would require time for consideration, and it would therefore defer judgment.

THE NEW IRONSIDES.

The Navy Department is in the receipt of a report from Com. Rowan, of the Ironsides, which states that that vessel has been fourteen times under fire of the Confederate batteries, and that she successfully destroyed the Wachewen when temporarily ashore, and silenced all the batteries when her guns were in full and active play. It is held among all the naval officers that the Ironsides can safely cross the ocean, but the monitors have been made for no such purpose, though they have rode out storms that possibly might not be exceeded in crossing the seas. The time is not far back when it was held that iron-clads could not be made to cross the ocean in safety; but the idea is being gradually abandoned among naval men. The Ironsides, a small iron-clad, could successfully stand the test of the high seas, and it is certain that several of the vessels now under completion are intended for foreign voyages.

A CANDID ADMISSION.

The Congressional Committee on "the Conduct of the War" state in their published report that "the Administration called by the people to the head of the Government, in this the most critical period of the nation's history, has been more promptly and fully supported than that of any other Government of which history has preserved any record. The call of the President for money and men has been more than complied with; no legislation which he has deemed necessary has been denied by Congress; and the people have most nobly and generously supported and sustained what their representatives had promised 'in their name.'"

This statement is entirely just, and its justice is not essentially diminished by any thing that has occurred since it was originally made. The people to-day, though we believe a large majority of them dissent from some of the measures of the Administration, are not willing to say or do any thing that can embarrass its operations or detract from its efficiency. Many see (or honestly think they see) that the Administration makes mistakes, and if they give expression to this belief in particular instances, it is because they desire to guard it against errors injurious to the cause of the Union, and not because of any "factious opposition" waged on purely political grounds. That there are others who do oppose the men and measures of the Administration for partisan reasons or objects, is undoubted; but they make little impression on public opinion, and do more damage to themselves than to the Administration. And yet, if we were to judge from the tone of certain Administration papers, we should be constrained to believe that there never was an Administration which had so much to fear from the people as this, and if we should take them at their word, we should be compelled to infer, from the frequency of their appeals to "support the Administration," that never was an Administration so badly supported. We are glad to see that that intelligent Administration paper, the New York Evening Post, does not concur in this view, or imitate these parrot cries. In its number of the 24th instant it says:

"The Government has made mistakes; it has at times pursued an illogical, weak, and timid policy; it has done some things calculated to alienate popular sympathy; but, outside of that really unimportant class which have made personal enmity paramount to the public good, it has always been able to rely upon a solid, unconditional, and efficient support. No more powerful power in this country has been stronger in times past than party feeling; it has resembled the clasp of earlier states of society; men have given fortune, reputation, and ceaseless and unparalyzing efforts to the cause of their political party; nevertheless, the popular attachment to the constituted authorities, using all the arts of the demagogue to inflame local and factional prejudice, and array one of the great parties of the country in open hostility to the war and the Government. But in every instance, in every State where this has been attempted, a temporary success only has rewarded the effort, and an honest disclosure of the designs of the men so engaged to the sober second thought of the people has always brought ignominious failure upon their schemes."

THE COTTON PLANTING EXPERIMENT.

The following extract from a letter in the Chicago Tribune discloses that the cotton planting experiment in Southern Illinois has proved a failure:

"The failure of the cotton planting experiment in Illinois, though resulting from a frost, which is extraordinary for the extent and severity at so early a date, will, as any one conversant with the temperate zone of the country knows, be a very favorable season would have lured them into most expensive enterprises, in future years, which could not be otherwise so disastrous. It is surprising that intelligent men should have encouraged this experiment in Illinois, Missouri, and Kansas, in cotton planting, when the fact is notorious that the plant is never cultivated, except on a very small scale, in North Carolina and Tennessee, north of the 36th parallel of latitude. Not one of the cotton countries in these States is situated in a favorable position. Between the 35th and 36th degrees cotton is cultivated, often successfully, but is subject to be blighted by frost. The most northern county in North Carolina where cotton is cultivated extensively and successfully is Edgecomb, which is situated in the lowlands, and has its climate tempered by the sea breeze. The upland counties in the same latitude cultivate cotton on a small scale, but often have their crops cut off by frost. But in the western part of the State—that is to say, west of Raleigh, the State capital—cotton is not successfully planted, except in the extreme bordering counties. The upland counties in the same latitude in the same latitudes, the results are the same. Maury, of which Columbia is the county seat, is one of the finest counties in the Mississippi valley. It is southwest of Nashville, with a large cotton belt, and yet the cotton culture is not successful. When some of these cotton countries are situated in the lowlands of the east. The cotton statistics of Tennessee show that even in the lowlands, no cotton is produced in counties on the Kentucky border—in Owsen, Weakly, Belmont, and Maury. The cotton statistics of the State show that the best cotton districts of Mississippi in productive areas. In Arkansas the same law of climate prevails. The southern counties constitute the very heart and center of the cotton region of the United States, while the northern counties produce very little, and some of them none at all, although the soil is highly fertile. If people will attempt to produce tropical or semi-tropical plants in the colder regions of the north, they have no alternative but to put them in hot houses."

A RUSSIAN FLEET AT NEW YORK.

The Russian steam frigates Alexander, Capt. Fedoravsky, and Peresviet, Capt. Kopylov, arrived at New York on Thursday morning from Cronstadt, and anchored in the North River. The Alexander is the flag-ship of Rear Admiral Lesovsky, and is of 800 horse power and mounts 51 guns. The Peresviet is of 450 horse power and mounts 46 guns.

The following additional Russian war vessels are expected to arrive in a few days: Corvette Varig, Capt. Lund, mounting 16 guns, with engines of 360 horse power; corvette Vitse, Capt. Kiemer, of 16 guns and 300 horse power; clipper Almos, Capt. Salenoy, 9 guns and 360 horse power; clipper Isoumoud of 9 guns and 360 horse power; clipper Isoumoud, 9 guns and 360 horse power. The Russian fleet, says the New York Times, will comprise eight ships, so far as heard from. The formal presentation of resolutions adopted by the Common Council tendering the hospitality of the city to Capt. Boutokoff and the officers of the Russian frigate Ostia was postponed till Capt. B. is quiet until the arrival of the fleet.

The Vitse and Varig have arrived since the above was written.

THE TROUBLES IN MISSOURI.

It is known to our readers that a portion of the people of Missouri have organized themselves into a political faction, hostile to the present Administration, under the name and style of the "Radical Emancipationist party." It is composed of anti-slavery zealots, German red republicans, and political agitators, embracing, under one head or another, a considerable number, though doubtless a minority of the people of this distracted State. It has recently placed in nomination a ticket for Judges of the Supreme Court, consisting of Henry A. Clover, Arnold Kregel, and David Wagner. The candidates for the same office supported by the conservative Union men are Messrs. Barton Bates, W. O. N. Bay, and John D. S. Dryden—the first named being a son of Mr. Attorney General Bates. It is painful to mark the language of political misrepresentations which these "Radical Emancipationists" habitually hold towards their loyal opponents and towards the President of the United States. They manifest in their political speech as little respect for decency as for truth, and offer in their organs a fair illustration of that malignity which seems to constitute the chief claim of political emancipationists to the rank and title of "philanthropists."

The St. Louis "Democrat" is a received exponent of this anti-slavery fanaticism run to seed, and its columns daily betray the factious hostility of its editors to the loyal men who do not share its radical ideas, and to the present Administration, which refuses to lend itself to the furtherance of the revolutionary purposes foreshadowed or boldly espoused by the "Radical Emancipationists" of Missouri. If we would judge of the direction which this journal seeks to impress on the pending canvass for the election of State Judges, we have but to mark such key notes as the following. We quote from the Democrat of the 22d instant:

"Messrs. Clover, Kregel, and Wagner compose the Union ticket. Messrs. Bates, Bates, and Bay compose the Copperhead ticket. We mean exactly what we say. There are but two parties in Missouri today, as every intelligent man knows—the Union and the Disunion parties."

The "Radical Emancipationists," composed of men who are equally hostile to the civil government of Missouri, to the Federal military commander of the department of Missouri, and to President Lincoln, are thus characterized by this sheet as the only "Union party" in the State. Their opponents, consisting of men who sustain Governor Gamble, Gen. Schofield, and the President of the United States, are, on the other hand, denounced as "Disunionists." This is the complexion to which anti-slavery propaganda in Missouri has finally brought its patrons and adherents. Denouncing their loyal and law-abiding neighbors as "Disunionists," they factiously resist the Federal military commander in their district, and revile the President, from whom he holds his command. Indeed, they make the President an especial object of assault, and we find their chief organ, the St. Louis Democrat, speaking of the National Administration as "stubbornly planting itself in the path of reform," and again saying that the operations of "prowling robbers" and "assassins" are "invited and protected by the policy of the Government in Missouri." And, as if this were not enough, they represent "Mr. Lincoln himself as being as violently against 'reform' and 'freedom' as Mr. Vallandigham, and as guilty of the massacre at Lawrence as Quantrill." Such is the support which these "Radical Emancipationists" of Missouri give to the Administration. And it is of men thus arrayed in active hostility against the President and his military policy that the New York Tribune speaks as follows:

"Whoever supposed that the cause of immediate emancipation in Missouri was abandoned when the Convention failed to pass its radical ordinance, which was really for the perpetuation and not the extinction of slavery, underrated the courage and devotion of the Radical party in that State. Against all obstacles and discouragements the struggle for freedom is resolutely maintained. The State is to be saved both by faith and works; by unswerving fidelity to the principles of universal liberty which underlie this conflict, and by unremitting efforts in politics, in military affairs, in social life, to establish their ascendancy. We regard the success of the Radical party in Missouri as inseparably blended with the interests of the State, its freedom, and its adherence to the Union; and we watch its progress with scarcely less solicitude than we have felt for the heroic Unionists of East Tennessee."

"There are really but two parties in Missouri—the Conservatives and the Radicals. The former is divided into two sections—open disloyalists and conservatives; but the action of the party is so wholly controlled by traitors, and is so wholly directed in the interest of the rebellion, that the conservatives are practically identified with their allies. The people of the State are so divided, that they maintain a constant equality close with the traitors, and to whose general policy they have never for a moment given their assent. They oppose the proclamation of emancipation, the confiscation act, the conscription act, and even the establishment of State military syndicates. They have yet they enjoy its patronage, control its offices, and have fully succeeded in creating a feeling of antagonism between the Administration and the only party in the State which unequivocally supports its measures. And it is to the adoption of their policy that Missouri owes most of her misfortunes for the last two years and her present deplorable condition."

The New York Times writes of these feds in Missouri under better inspirations. It deplores the spirit of faction which, in a blind and fatuous zeal against slavery, leads these Radical Emancipationists to embarrass and denounce the Government of the State and of the Nation. We signalize the language of the Times with the more satisfaction because, so far as we are aware, it is the only Republican journal which has come to the defence of the Administration against these radical assaults. After expressing the opinion that Missouri is more dangerously disturbed, if not more dangerously disloyal than Mississippi, the Times proceeds as follows:

"We do not exaggerate the facts in this matter, and we are sorry to have to say that the existing evils in Missouri appear, in the main part, to spring from the ungovernable passions and the insubordinate machinations of a party in that State that have heretofore professed to be loyal to the Government of the United States. But their misfortune is, that they think themselves more loyal than the laws of Congress, more loyal than the Union officers and soldiers in the State, more loyal than the President himself and his advisers. There is a radical party in Missouri that is preaching as much contempt for national authority, and encouraging as much hatred and opposition to the off-

THE BATTLE OF CHICKAMAUGA.

We to-day spread before our readers the graphic account of the battle of Chickamauga, as described by the correspondent of the Cincinnati Gazette, and to which reference was made by us yesterday. The writer of this narrative, we learn from the Gazette, has long been associated with the army of Gen. Rosecrans, and by familiarity with its several commands as well as by former practice in the difficult "art of describing battles," has singular qualifications for the work he has taken in hand. His narrative will certainly be found as interesting as it is graphic.

As the War Department has not thought proper to lay before the people any official intelligence in regard to the late disastrous battles of Chickamauga, which have resulted in the repulse of Gen. Rosecrans, we are necessarily compelled to rely on the statements of unofficial writers, like the intelligent correspondent of our Cincinnati contemporary. From his accounts it appears that the Union army have sustained a serious reverse in this quarter—a fact which we suppose explains the reticence of the War Department, as it had already been generally inferred from such reticence. The proportions of the calamity are indeed even greater than had been surmised. The defeat and dispersion of two corps of Gen. Rosecrans' army, (that of Crittenden and that of McCook), with a loss of ten thousand in killed and wounded, (exclusive of prisoners, set down at two thousand five hundred), and of fifty pieces of artillery, constitute, in proportion to the numbers engaged, the greatest disaster which has yet happened to either party in the history of the war. That the army escaped a total defeat is due, it would seem, to the stubborn valor of the troops comprising one of the corps, and to the masterly conduct of Major Gen. Thomas, its commander.

It is not for us at present to appreciate the causes or the consequences of this disaster, which, it will be seen, has resulted from the superiority of the enemy's forces, concentrated in this attack on Rosecrans. Why this officer should be left to cope with an enemy superior in numbers, when the means of reinforcing him were at the command of the Government, (as is proved by the fact that reinforcements are now on the way to him), is a question about which, as we know nothing, we shall say nothing. It is enough to say that with our superiority in numbers it is a little singular that on so many occasions the enemy has been able to give us battle with the advantage of heavier columns on his side. Whether it be from the interior lines on which the enemy operates, or from the greater celerity and secrecy of his movements, or from the superior sagacity of his strategy in the general conduct of the war, it is certain that his heroism of our troops has often been put to tests which reflect more glory on them than credit on the military management to which they are subject.

The Springfield Republican, in commenting on this battle, remarks:

"It is curious to observe how in all our campaigns the same movements are repeated. The rebels adhere to their policy of concentration both to the whole scope of the war and the handling of their troops in each battle; and still repeat the mistake of concentrating their forces at distant points around the borders of rebellion, and in each battle offer to the rebel troops extended and early penetrated lines, as if to ensure success to their favorite tactics. In the late battle, however, the nature of the country and the lack of time for concentration before the attack was made compelled Rosecrans to fight at this disadvantage. It was matter of necessity, not of choice; and it enabled the enemy to throw his whole army into confusion, with the exception of the single corps of Gen. Thomas. It is also notable that the rebels were able to follow the strategy marked out for them by Schick, the German military essayist, not because of his suggestion probably, but because they saw it to be their true policy. Yet neither in Maryland and Pennsylvania, nor in Georgia, has the policy of concentration been followed by either entire success; but it has failed by lack of man and means, and by the indomitable fighting of our inferior forces. The lesson yet to be learned, after all our mistakes of the same sort, is concentration; or, if the policy of scattering our forces and the lack of time for concentration, as so many widely separated points is to be persisted in, then several hundred thousand more men."

In the presence of this disaster many have anxiously inquired "what has become of the large armies lately operating under Generals Grant and Banks before Vicksburg and Port Hudson? Why could not Gen. Rosecrans' columns have been strengthened from their forces, released as they were from operations in the Mississippi Valley by the fall of these two places?" We are unable to give a satisfactory answer to these questions, though we believe it will be found that the disposable forces of either Gen. Banks or Gen. Grant have been greatly exaggerated. And a portion of these, it is known, were diverted in an abortive expedition into Texas for the capture of cotton, instead of being ordered to join Gen. Rosecrans, or sent on an expedition co-operative with his movements. The New York Tribune, in remarking on the failure of the Texas expedition, holds the following language:

"In view of the consequences which have resulted from disregarding military principles in a military expedition, the Government is urged now that the chance of seizing the cotton supposed to be in the Sabine district was an equivalent for the advantage which a properly-directed effort would have insured. Still less is a plea a justification of the disaster which the violation of the plainest and simplest rules of war has caused. We advert to such a topic with reluctance. We consider it consistent neither with national reputation nor national honor to organize an expedition under the national flag against a quantity of cotton. There is no objection to confiscating cotton or any other rebel property when it falls accidentally into military possession. But this is a very different matter. We have lost fourteen guns, three ships, and many lives; have lost time which was within our grasp; have lost the use of the troops which were urgently wanted elsewhere; and we have not even the cotton to balance the account. We shall be glad to be assured that we have seen the last of such expeditions."

The Washington correspondent of the Boston Traveller states that Gen. Halleck protested earnestly against the diversion of our troops involved in the projected invasion of Texas, and that Mr. Lincoln himself held out until overcome by the advocates of the scheme. Had the troops intended for Texas sailed for Mobile, Johnston could never have reinforced Bragg and in all probability Rosecrans would not have been worsted near Chattanooga. The New York Evening Post, in alluding to the unsatisfactory result of the battle of Chickamauga, inculcates the same lesson and utters the same complaint, as it says:

"No supporting columns are ever at hand. Now that Rosecrans wants Bragg, and might win a splendid victory by his aid, Burnside is some two hundred miles away! A small town called Jonesboro, in East Tennessee, was deemed of more importance apparently than the success of the Army of the Cumberland."